

*California  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing*

*Meeting of  
June 5, 2003*

**AGENDA ITEM NUMBER:**        **PREP - 3**

**COMMITTEE:**                      **Preparation Standards**

**TITLE:**                              **Revision of Subject Matter Program Standard 6:  
Assessment of Subject Matter Competence,  
Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness  
for the Subject Matter Requirement for the  
Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and  
Proposed Consolidation of California's  
Licensure Exams**

  **X**   **Action**

       **Information**

       **Report**

**Strategic Plan Goal(s):**

- Goal 1:**        **Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators**
- Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators
  - Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates

**Presented By:**        **Amy Jackson**

**Prepared By:**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Amy Jackson**  
**Administrator, Professional Services Division**

**Approved By:**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Beth Graybill**  
**Interim Director, Professional Services Division**

**Approved By:**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Linda Bond**  
**Director, Office of Governmental Relations**

**Authorized By:**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Dr. Sam W. Swofford**  
**Executive Director**



**Revision of Subject Matter Program Standard 6: Assessment of Subject  
Matter Competence, Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the  
Subject Matter Requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential  
and Proposed Consolidation of California's Licensure Exams**

**Professional Services Division**

**June 5, 2003**

**Executive Summary**

Senate Bill 2042 (1998, Alpert and Mazzoni) calls for the Commission to ensure that teacher preparation and assessment is fully aligned to the K-12 student academic content standards (Education Code Section 44259, (5) and Section 60605). The law also requires that teacher candidate assessment be streamlined. In September 2001 the Commission adopted the *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Subject Matter Requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential*. *Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence* required the subject matter program to include a summative assessment of the subject matter competence of each prospective multiple subject teacher during one or more program capstone experiences. It required that the assessment be consistent with the provisions of *Standard 1: Substance of the Subject Matter Program Curriculum*.

A letter sent in early 2003 from Secretary Kerry Mazzoni and state Senator Dede Alpert, the authors of Senate Bill 2042, regarding the Commission's model teaching performance assessment cautioned the Commission about the magnitude of the state budget crisis. The Commission was asked to work with representatives of the higher education institutions to determine whether the model teaching performance assessment could be redesigned to lower costs. Concern has also been expressed regarding the scope and cost of requiring teacher candidates to pass several different examinations in order to complete the requirements set forth by the California Education Code. Staff addresses these issues in this agenda item and makes specific recommendations toward resolving them.

**Fiscal Impact Summary**

The Commission budget supports the costs of these activities and no budget augmentation is needed.

### **Policy Issues to be Addressed**

1. Should the Commission revise *Standard 6, Assessment of Subject Matter Competence* governing the culminating assessment required of California teaching candidates completing an approved subject matter program to require a valid, reliable assessment that meets a rigorous state standard?
2. Should the Commission move to consolidate the different examinations now required of California teacher credential candidates?

### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Commission:

1. Adopt the proposed revisions to *Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence* to provide a statewide, consistent measure as part of a performance index. It is recommended that staff be directed to provide technical assistance to institutions with approved subject matter programs.

Staff proposes that the Commission:

2. Take action to move to develop a plan to consolidate several of the currently required assessments.

# **Revision of Subject Matter Program Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence, Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Subject Matter Requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and Proposed Consolidation of California's Licensure Exams**

## **Professional Services Division**

**June 5, 2003**

### **Summary**

*The Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Subject Matter Requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential* were adopted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing in September 2001. Subject matter program *Standard 6: Culminating Assessment of Subject Matter Competence* was adopted in 1988, and revised as a result of SB 2042. This standard governs the culminating assessment required of all teaching candidates completing an approved undergraduate subject matter preparation program. The current standard allows a wide variety of approaches to assessment, including projects and portfolios. California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) staff recommends a revision of the standard to require approved subject matter programs to ensure that all candidates pass a valid, reliable, uniform assessment that meets a rigorous state standard.

Revising this standard could allow the Commission to consolidate into one assessment the requirements that are now addressed by several separate examinations. Revising this standard could also pave the way for a less expensive, more streamlined teaching performance assessment, to be made available to teacher preparation programs to assess the performance of teacher candidates during their student teaching experience. Finally, this approach could provide for increased accountability over teacher preparation, based upon yearly objective data as called for by the Commission's Teacher Preparation Performance Index (TPPI).

### **Background**

In recent years, the Commission has been engaged in numerous initiatives designed to:

- 1) align teacher preparation programs, examinations and performance assessments with the State Board adopted K-12 content standards;
- 2) review and revise SB 2042 provisions to respond to concerns raised by policymakers and educators;
- 3) hold preparation programs accountable for effective teacher preparation in subject matter and pedagogy based upon objective data on candidate performance;
- 4) create data indicators to assist future teachers, undergraduate universities, teacher preparation programs, school districts and policymakers with more robust, frequent and quantitative data on the performance of teacher candidates and program graduates;
- 5) review educator preparation accreditation procedures;
- 6) streamline requirements on teacher candidates prepared in California;
- 7) reduce barriers to teachers prepared in other states; and

- 8) provide technical assistance to policymakers charged with designing policies and practices in response to federal mandates.

Specifically, in the spring of 2001, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing was asked by Governor Gray Davis to strengthen accountability in teacher preparation and support the educational community in meeting the rigorous new standards set out in the SB 2042 legislation (1998, Alpert and Mazzoni). Effective teacher preparation, aligned to the K-12 student performance standards, is essential to California's goal of improving student achievement. With the governor's leadership and direction, Commission staff began working to discuss and develop a series of quality indicators that could be used as a potential TPPI. The indicators include a consistent, statewide measure of teacher performance.

In early 2003, the Commission received a letter regarding the Commission's model teaching performance assessment from Secretary Kerry Mazzoni and state Senator Dede Alpert, the authors of Senate Bill 2042. While reaffirming the goal of implementing policies and procedures that would improve teacher preparation and enhance accountability, Secretary Mazzoni and Senator Alpert cautioned the Commission that the magnitude of California's budget crisis in 2003 has resulted in budget reductions for higher education. They requested that the Commission enter into discussions with representatives of the higher education institutions in an effort to determine whether the model teaching performance assessment could be redesigned to lower costs.

## **Proposed Revision to Standard 6**

Senate Bill 2042 (1998, Alpert and Mazzoni) calls for the Commission to ensure that teacher preparation and assessment is fully aligned to the K-12 student academic content standards (Education Code Sections 44259, (5) and 60605). In addition, the law requires that teacher candidate assessment be streamlined (Section 44320.2 (c)).

In September 2001 the Commission adopted the *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Subject Matter Requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential*. *Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence* required the subject matter program to include a summative assessment of the subject matter competence of each prospective multiple subject teacher during one or more program capstone experiences. It required that the assessment be consistent with the provisions of *Standard 1: Substance of the Subject Matter Program Curriculum* (see Appendix A). The scope of Standard 1 incorporates the content of Standards 2 and 3 (see Appendix A), the *Content Specifications* (see [www.ctc.ca.gov](http://www.ctc.ca.gov)) and courses completed in the program and previously at other institutions.

Commission staff has developed the following proposed revision to *Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Competence*:

### **Standard 6: Culminating Assessment of Subject Matter Competence**

The subject matter program includes a rigorous, uniform, culminating summative assessment. ~~of the subject matter competence of. Each prospective multiple subject teacher during one or more program capstone experiences. The assessment is consistent with the provision of Program Standards 2 and 3, the Content Specifications in Appendix~~

A and in courses completed in the program and previously at other institutions candidate is required to demonstrate subject matter competence to a comparable statewide standard, across the range of subject matter required by Education Code Section 51210 and incorporated in the California Student Academic Content Standards and State Curriculum Frameworks, focusing on grades K through 8. Areas of study include reading, language and literature; history and social science; mathematics; science; visual and performing arts; physical education; health; and human development.

Required Elements for Standard 6: Culminating Assessment of Subject Matter Competence

- 6.1 ~~In fairness to each prospective teacher in the program, t~~The culminating summative assessment is congruent in scope and content with her or his specific studies in the program and at previously attended institutions rigorous and appropriately covers the range of subject matter defined in Program Standards 1 and 2.
- 6.2 ~~The uniform, systematic procedures that govern the culminating summative assessment includes two or more assessment methods such as performance, portfolio, presentation, research project, field experience journal, work sample, interview, oral examination, and written examination a defensible process for evaluating performance (according to the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education, 1999), an assessment score appeal process, and a procedure for prospective teachers to repeat portions of the subject matter assessment.~~
- 6.3 ~~The systematic procedures that govern the summative assessment include a defensible process for evaluating performance, an appeal process, and a procedure for prospective teachers to repeat portions of the assessment as needed sponsoring institution ensures that thorough records are maintained of each prospective teacher's summative assessment scores.~~
- 6.4 ~~The sponsoring institution ensures that thorough records are maintained of each prospective teacher's performance in the summative assessment. Program staff formally evaluates, on at least an annual basis, the quality, fairness and effectiveness of the uniform, culminating subject matter assessment, including its consistency with the requirements and elements of Program Standards 1 and 2.~~
- 6.5 ~~A program may choose to provide a formal assessment of subject matter competence for prospective multiple subject teachers who hold a baccalaureate degree but have not completed a California approved program of subject matter preparation. In such cases the evaluation of coursework will be completed by qualified faculty. The sponsoring institution acts on assessment evaluation findings, ensuring a uniform and equitable assessment of prospective candidates' subject matter competence. Where indicated by the findings of the evaluation, the sponsoring institution makes changes to curriculum programs, processes or procedures to assist students in meeting the passing standard of the culminating subject matter assessment.~~

~~6.6 The program staff periodically evaluates the quality, fairness and effectiveness of the assessment, including its consistency with the requirements and elements of Program Standard 1.~~

## Implementation of a Revised Standard 6

It is expected that colleges and universities would develop a rigorous, uniform, valid and reliable assessment to meet the requirements of *Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Competence*. In doing so, colleges and universities would have to demonstrate that such an assessment met all of the elements of *Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Competence*, including the element calling for the assessment to meet a rigorous statewide standard.

It is likely that universities, as a segment, or as a whole, will want to turn to a national testing company, contracting with the company to administer an assessment that has been developed and validated for the specific purpose of determining competence in basic skills, subject matter and reading aligned with the California K-12 Content Standards. California universities, working together, could arrange with a testing company to administer the exam on each campus at regular intervals. Universities would want to encourage candidates to take “practice” exams, since the standard calls for the approved programs to assist candidates who may be having difficulty passing the assessment.

## Current Requirements

Candidates seeking California Multiple Subject or Single Subject teaching credentials are currently required to take and pass several examinations in order to complete the requirements set forth by the California Education Code. The table below portrays current examination requirements for candidates.

<b><i>California Credential</i></b>	CBEST	Subject Matter or Course Work (Culminating Test)	RICA	Teaching Performance Assessment* ( <i>delayed</i> )
Multiple Subject	X	X	X	X
Single Subject	X	X		X

*\*During the 2003-2004 academic year, institutions will be held to program Standard 19 which requires candidates to take and pass an assessment that measures the recently validated, teaching performance expectations.*

Multiple Subject candidates must take and pass the California Basic Skills Test (CBEST), a state adopted subject matter exam or approved university course work with a culminating test, a Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) and a teaching performance, assessment. When a candidate takes and passes these examinations, successfully completes a teacher preparation program, and passes an embedded teaching performance assessment, he or she is recommended for a preliminary credential. (Some candidates also take the Cross-cultural



Language and Academic Development or Bilingual Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) examinations to obtain an authorization to teach English learners in English and English learners in languages other than English as established in the SB 1059 legislation.)

Single Subject candidates are required to take and pass CBEST and demonstrate subject matter competency either through approved course work or by examination. They are not currently required to take and pass RICA, the reading examination.

A teaching performance assessment is also required by SB 2042 (Education Code Sections 44259 (3), 44320.2). The Commission and its contractor, Educational Testing Service (ETS), are currently developing a model.

### **Concerns Raised Regarding the Number of Tests Currently Required**

Each of the exams and assessments required of teacher candidates is required by California law. Few have argued that teacher candidates should not be required to demonstrate competency in basic skills, subject matter, reading instruction and instructional methodology. However, candidates, university faculty, representatives of the media, and policymakers have expressed concern about the number of separate exams that teacher candidates are required to take as well as the time and effort devoted to the system that calls for several separate assessments.

With respect to the teaching performance assessment, staff is suggesting that universities may want to arrange with a testing company to score the assessment, for a fee. This could maintain the requirement that the performance assessment be “embedded” in the preparation program, to the end that candidates would be provided feedback on their performance and assistance in meeting the assessment standards. This approach would relieve institutions of the specific burden that they report has been of most concern to them—the time and cost of scoring the tasks of the model performance assessment. It is important to note that one goal of consolidating the exams currently required of candidates is to decrease the costs of testing for candidates. This goal involves reducing the overall costs of teacher assessment in California, even if candidates are required to pay a fee for scoring of the teaching performance assessment. The provision of scoring by a testing company would have the added benefit of insuring greater equity and fairness in assessment.

It is also important to note that the proposed consolidation of examinations into one assessment for licensure would become one route to a credential. The Commission will want to continue to make the separate exams (CBEST, RICA and CSET) available to candidates until and unless a consolidated exam is made available to all candidates. The eventual outcome would be to have a consolidated assessment available to all candidates, and to provide the assessment in “components” that allows candidates to take each component separately if they so desire. Once the candidate passes a given component, he or she would not be required to pass it again. For example, if a candidate wanted to pass the basic skill component, in order to qualify as a substitute teacher, he or she would not be required to retake that component when pursuing a preliminary teaching credential

## **Consolidated Assessment**

Under the recently revised *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Subject Matter Requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential*, *Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence* defines how candidates are to be assessed on subject matter. This capstone, culminating assessment requires candidates to demonstrate proficiency of the *Content Specifications* and courses completed in the program and at other institutions. Multiple measures provide a more accurate diagnosis of performance and knowledge ability than any single measure. The job of teaching is complex and dynamic. An appropriate way to determine competence is through an array of measures combining both criterion reference methodologies with performance assessment. A consolidated, multi-measure assessment offers candidates a potentially more equitable opportunity to demonstrate minimum competency for a teaching license.

Revising *Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Competence* as proposed could allow the Commission to move toward a less costly, streamlined, two-phase approach to candidate assessment. The first phase would be completed by candidates prior to entry into a teacher preparation program. Phase I would measure and verify: 1- an acceptable level of proficiency in reading, writing and mathematics skills in English language, (basic educational skills) needed and used by all school practitioners; 2- subject matter, as defined by the recently validated subject matter requirements (SMRs), and 3- linguistics and language structure.

Phase II of the consolidated assessment could be completed during the candidate's student teaching experience. Pursuant to SB 2042, this assessment would be embedded in the teacher preparation program and measures a candidate's knowledge, skill and ability as defined by the 13 Teaching Performance Expectations validated, spring 2002 (see Appendix B) and reading instruction. Candidates will take this phase of the assessment during their teacher preparation program. Currently, the model has four distinct tasks that measure the teaching performance expectations:

- Task 1: Content Specific and Developmentally Appropriate Pedagogy;
- Task 2: Connecting Student Characteristics to Instructional Planning";
- Task 3: Classroom Assessment of Learning Goals"; and
- Task 4: Lesson Design, Implementing, and Reflection after Instruction" (including a videotape of an instructional event).

However, if consolidation of examinations is determined to be possible, the number of assessments could be decreased. Task 1 could be dropped from the sequence, because candidates would have met California subject matter requirements by either passing a state-adopted, stand-alone exam in lieu of an approved subject matter preparation program, or an equally rigorous, valid, reliable, uniform, standardized exam as part of their approved undergraduate subject matter program. By reducing the number of embedded tasks that a candidate must complete, the cost for administering and scoring the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CA TPA) could be lowered significantly.

## **Benefits to Candidates, Programs, Policymakers and the Public**

In summary, revising *Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Competence* as proposed would continue the efforts of the Commission in several key areas and result in the following short-

term and long-term multiple benefits to teacher candidates, preparation programs, policymakers and the public:

- Streamline examination requirements for candidates by creating a single assessment for licensure that measures basic skills, subject matter and the knowledge necessary to teach reading.
- Lower entry-level examination costs to candidates. Candidates would pay a single fee for the culminating assessment and would be able to take the examination at one time, in one place.
- Provide consistent data for institutions to use to evaluate liberal arts preparation programs and provide a tool to support program development and accountability.
- Provide consistent and transportable data to candidates.
- Provide longitudinal, uniform data and research to assist in future policy development.
- Lower anticipated administration costs to the teaching performance assessment. An external contractor would provide, for a fee, scoring services. Institutions would not be responsible for scoring the performance assessment tasks.
- Provide a valid examination that is aligned to other national examinations to meet comparability criteria and ease out of state teacher requirements for CA licensure.

## **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed revisions to *Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Competence: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence* to provide a statewide, consistent measure as part of a performance index. Commission staff further recommends that the revised standard be adopted for implementation by spring 2004. It is recommended that staff be directed to provide technical assistance to institutions with approved subject matter programs.

It is recommended that the Commission direct staff to develop a plan for consolidation of the existing teacher candidate assessment requirements.



## **Appendix A**

# **Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Subject Matter Requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential**



**State of California**

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

**September, 2001**

# Multiple Subject Teaching Credential

## Table of Contents

<b>Category I: Substance of the Subject Matter Program Curriculum .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Standard 1: Program Philosophy and Purpose .....	1
Standard 2: Required Subjects of Study .....	2
Standard 3: Depth of Study .....	3
Standard 4: Integrative Study .....	4
Standard 5: Effective Curriculum, Teaching and Assessment Practices ....	5
Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence .....	8
 <b>Category II: <i>Qualities of the Subject Matter Program Curriculum</i>.....</b>	<b>9</b>
Standard 7: Introductory Classroom Experiences (K-8).....	9
Standard 8: Diverse Perspectives .....	10
Standard 9: Technology in the Subject Matter Program.....	11
 <b>Category III: <i>Leadership and Implementation of the Subject Matter Program</i> .....</b>	<b>12</b>
Standard 10: Leadership of the Subject Matter Program.....	12
Standard 11: Resources for the Subject Matter Program.....	13
Standard 12: Advising Prospective Multiple Subject Teachers.....	14
Standard 13: Program Review and Development .....	15
 <b>Appendix A: Content Specifications for the Subject Matter Requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential .....</b>	<b>A-1</b>
Content Specifications in Reading, Language, and Literature.....	A-3
Content Specifications in History and Social Science.....	A-8
Content Specifications in Mathematics .....	A-13
Content Specifications in Science .....	A-17
Content Specifications in Visual and Performing Arts.....	A-22
Content Specifications in Physical Education.....	A-25
Content Specifications in Human Development .....	A-28
 <b>Appendix B: <i>Assembly Bill 537, Chapter 587, Statutes of 1999</i> .....</b>	<b>B-1</b>
 <b>Appendix C: Glossary of Specialized Terms Used in Draft Standards of Program Quality for Subject Matter Programs for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential.....</b>	<b>C-1</b>
 <b>Appendix D: Precondition .....</b>	<b>D-1</b>

## **Category I**

### **Substance of the Subject Matter Program Curriculum**

#### **Standard 1: Program Philosophy and Purpose**

The program of subject matter preparation for prospective multiple subject teachers is academically rigorous and intellectually stimulating. Program design follows from an explicit statement of program philosophy and purpose. The institution assigns high priority to and appropriately supports the program as an essential part of its mission.

#### **Required Elements for Standard 1: Program Philosophy and Purpose**

- 1.1 The program is designed to establish strong foundational understanding of subject matter so that extended subject matter learning can continue during the teachers' professional preparation, induction and development.
- 1.2 The program prepares well-educated beginning teachers who understand significant ideas, structures and values in the disciplines that underlie the K-8 curriculum.
- 1.3 The program is designed to prepare prospective multiple subject teachers to analyze situations; synthesize information from multiple sources; make decisions on rational bases; communicate skillfully; and appreciate diverse perspectives.
- 1.4 Pertaining to the program philosophy and purpose statement, the institution provides evidence of collaboration and consultation in its development and of dissemination of it to prospective and enrolled students and to local schools, among others.

## **Standard 2: Required Subjects of Study**

In the program, each prospective multiple subject teacher studies and learns subjects that are required by Education Code Section 51210<sup>1</sup> and incorporated in *California Student Academic Content Standards*<sup>2</sup> and *State Curriculum Frameworks*, focusing on grades K through 8, including the following major subject areas of study: reading, language and literature; history and social science; mathematics; science; visual and performing arts; physical education; health; and human development. The curriculum of the program addresses the *Content Specifications for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential* as set forth in Appendix A beginning on page 17 of this handbook.

### **Required Elements for Standard 2: Required Subjects of Study**

- 2.1 Required coursework in the program includes appropriate study in each major subject area.
- 2.2 In each major subject area, the program's coursework fulfills the provisions and elements of Standard 1.
- 2.3 In the program, remedial classes and other studies normally completed in K-12 schools are not counted in satisfaction of the required subjects of study.
- 2.4 The institution that sponsors the program determines, establishes and implements a standard of minimum scholarship (such as overall GPA, minimum course grade or other assessments) of program completion for prospective multiple subject teachers.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A, page 2 (A-2) for the verbatim text of Section 51210.

<sup>2</sup> In those areas where Academic Content Standards have not been adopted, programs should refer to other California Department of Education Standards such as the Challenge Standards.



### **Standard 3: Depth of Study**

The program offers a set of concentrations and/or majors, each of which relates directly to one or more of the major subject areas of study. In the program, each prospective multiple subject teacher selects and completes a concentration or major consisting of twelve or more semester units (or the equivalent) of courses that are coherently related to each other. In each concentration and major, prospective teachers develop a strong understanding of the conceptual foundations of the subject as well as an understanding of how knowledge is created and organized in the subject. A concentration may include no more than three semester units (or the equivalent) of coursework that is required of all prospective teachers in the program.

#### **Required Elements for Standard 3: Depth of Study**

- 3.1 Each concentration and major examines the principal topics and most fundamental ideas in the subject area. The sponsor(s) of each concentration and major describes how it represents a coherent course of study that extends or builds on core studies that all prospective teachers complete in the program.
- 3.2 In each concentration, at least twelve semester units (or the equivalent) examine the content of the subject; if pre-professional studies are part of a concentration, they are in addition to 12 semester units of content studies in the concentration.

<p><b>Note:</b> The subject matter program may fulfill Standard 3 (Depth of Study) in conjunction with Standard 4 (Integrative Study) by offering one or more integrative concentrations and/or by recognizing one or more cross-disciplinary majors.</p>
---



## Appendix B

### Description of the California Teaching Performance Assessment

The California Teaching Performance Assessment (CA TPA) is an assessment of a candidate's ability to demonstrate competency of the Teaching Performance Expectations. The CA TPA is designed for candidates seeking the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and for candidates seeking a Single Subject Teaching Credential in any specific subject area(s). The CA TPA provides a series of four performance tasks that candidates complete during their professional preparation program. The results of the candidates' performance during the various tasks of the CA TPA can help provide formative assessment information to candidates for improving the quality of their teaching, and assists candidates to focus on those aspects of teaching in which they may need further development or support. The CA TPA is intended to be embedded within the teacher preparation program, and for programs that have chosen to use this model, must be successfully completed as one of the requirements for earning a California preliminary teaching credential.

The CA TPA includes four tasks, which collectively measure the attributes of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). TPEs describe what all California beginning teachers need to know and be able to do to qualify for the Preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential. Each task measures aspects of a number of TPEs, and many TPEs are measured in more than one task.

All tasks are designed so that candidates can practice them repeatedly. All tasks will be released prior to the actual assessment so that candidates can consider appropriate, accurate, and complete responses. Task One may be completed without candidates basing their responses on the needs of K-12 students they may be currently teaching, while Tasks Two through Four require interaction with K-12 California students. All tasks require written responses to given prompts, and Task Four requires a videotaped teaching experience.

Below is a description of the four tasks, including the TPEs measured by each task.

#### *Task 1: Principles of Content-Specific and Developmentally Appropriate Pedagogy*

Within this task, the candidate will respond to four distinct scenarios that cover developmentally appropriate pedagogy, assessment practices, adaptation of content-specific pedagogy for English learners, and adaptation of content-specific pedagogy for students with special needs, respectively. Each scenario is based on specific components in the candidate's subject matter content area. For example, Multiple Subject candidates will address English/Language Arts in the first scenario, Mathematics in the second, Science in the third, and History/Social Science in the fourth. This written task is not dependent upon working with actual K-12 students. The following TPEs are measured in this task:

- Making subject matter comprehensible to students (TPE 1)
- Assessing student learning (TPE 3)
- Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 4, 6, 7)

*Task 2: Connecting Instructional Planning to Student Characteristics for Academic Learning*

Task Two connects learning about student characteristics to instructional planning. This written task contains a five-step set of prompts that focuses the candidate on the connections between students' characteristics and learning needs and instructional planning and adaptations. The following TPEs are measured in this task:

- Making subject matter comprehensible to students (TPE 1)
- Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 4, 6, 7)
- Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students (TPE 8, 9)
- Developing as a professional educator (TPE 13)

*Task 3: Classroom Assessment of Academic Learning Goals*

Task Three gives candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to design standards-based, developmentally appropriate student assessment activities in the context of a small group of students using a specific lesson of their choice. In addition, candidates demonstrate their ability to assess student learning and to diagnose student needs. The following TPEs are measured in this task.

- Assessing student learning (TPE 3)
- Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 6, 7)
- Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students (TPE 8, 9)
- Developing as a professional educator (TPE 13)

*Task 4: Academic Lesson Design, Implementation, and Reflection after Instruction*

This task asks the candidates to design a standards-based lesson for a class of students, implement that lesson making appropriate use of class time and instructional resources, meet the differing needs of individuals within the class, manage instruction and student interaction, assess student learning, and analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson. To ensure equity to the candidate, a videotape of the lesson is collected and reviewed. The following TPEs are measured in this task.

- Making subject matter comprehensible to students (TPE 1)
- Assessing student learning (TPE 2, 3)
- Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 4, 5, 6, 7)
- Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students (TPE 8, 9)
- Creating and maintaining effective environments for student learning (TPE 10, 11)
- Developing as a professional educator (TPE 13)

## **California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)**

### **A. MAKING SUBJECT MATTER COMPREHENSIBLE TO STUDENTS**

- TPE 1 Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction
  - a. Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills for Multiple Subject Teaching Assignments
  - b. Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills for Single Subject Teaching Assignments

### **B. ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING**

- TPE 2 Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction
- TPE 3 Interpretation and Use of Assessments

### **C. ENGAGING AND SUPPORTING STUDENTS IN LEARNING**

- TPE 4 Making Content Accessible
- TPE 5 Student Engagement
- TPE 6 Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices
  - a. Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades K-3
  - b. Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades 4-8
  - c. Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades 9-12
- TPE 7 Teaching English Learners

### **D. PLANNING INSTRUCTION AND DESIGNING LEARNING EXPERIENCES FOR STUDENTS**

- TPE 8 Learning about Students
- TPE 9 Instructional Planning

### **E. CREATING AND MAINTAINING EFFECTIVE ENVIRONMENTS FOR STUDENT LEARNING**

- TPE 10 Instructional Time
- TPE 11 Social Environment

### **F. DEVELOPING AS A PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR**

- TPE 12 Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations
- TPE 13 Professional Growth

